



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

amount going to the fabric fund. Up to 1874 silk scarfs, hat-bands, and gloves were given to the clergy, officers, and choir. The value of these perquisites was submitted to solemn arbitration, and it was decided that in lieu thereof there should be made to the choir, organist, and servants a money payment amounting to £31 2s. 6d. Total fees for interment now charged are for the fabric fund, £26, £36 or £46, according to the decree of the person buried. The fees of the dean, canon, choir, officers, and verger are fixed at £34 2s. 6d., which, with the £31 2s. 6d. presented to the choir, organist, and servants, makes a total varying from £91 4s. 8d. to £110 4s. 8d. Formerly the scarfs, hat-bands, and gloves were charged in the undertaker's bill, and it will be seen that economies to that amount, which would certainly not be less than £31 2s. 6d., have been effected at the Abbey.

The conclusion arrived at upon the inquiry undertaken by the Royal Commission, assisted by the business aptitude of the clerk of the Works, was that, using every available space for the purpose, not more than ninety to ninety-five interments may in future take place. At the western end of the nave there is probably room for forty-five coffins; twenty more might be laid in the concrete which supports the wall at the northwest corner of the north aisle, and possibly a dozen more coffins might be added to the "mixed parties" in the larger vaults not yet full. That, taking the average of persons deemed eligible for admission to the Abbey in recent times, would provide for all the just needs of the next hundred years.

Of the various projects submitted for supplying adjuncts to the Abbey that might be used as charnel-houses, the commissioners recommend the erection of a monumental chapel on a vacant piece of ground, the site of the old refectory, lying immediately south of the great cloister and parallel to the nave of the Abbey. But there is not much enthusiasm in the recommendation, nor has there, since it was submitted to the Queen, been any movement towards carrying it into effect. There seems, in truth, a disposition to extend to the unborn future the privilege of burying its dead, already claimed for the dead past.

HENRY W. LUCY.

JEWS IN THE UNION ARMY.

IN THE December number of *THE REVIEW*, Mr. J. M. Rogers, in a reply to Isaac Besht Bendavid's statement that "on both sides in that conflict the American Israelites stood shoulder to shoulder with their fellow citizens of all other races and creeds," says that in all his eighteen months' experience in the army he never met or heard of a Jewish soldier, and "if so many Jews fought bravely for their adopted country, surely their champion ought to be able to give the names of the regiments they condescended to accept service in."

Did Mr. Rogers make this absurd statement in the hope that no champion of the Jews would lift his pen in refutation of his assertions? Who Mr. Rogers is, and what prompted him to attack the Jewish people, I am at a loss to ascertain. But that he has resorted to means unworthy of impartial historical record, and that his outraged feelings have played sad havoc with his sense of fairness,—rashly assuming that he possessed this virtue in some small measure,—I can most safely affirm. There is not a semblance of truth in the charges with which he attempts to impeach Jewish national pride; otherwise his indictment would imply the justice of Mr. Goldwin Smith's denunciatory branding of the Jews as a "parasitic race."

Many of my co-religionists, wrathful at this scurrilous attack, have exclaimed: "Another page must be added to the historical record of the Civil War, telling of the heroic martyrdom the Jews rejoiced to suffer, to save their land from further degradation." And as a result of the agitation produced by this article, I am happy to say that work has already been begun for the preparation of a complete history of the part the Jews bore in the late struggle.

Immediately upon reading the article referred to, I wrote to Mr. Thomas S. Townsend, compiler of the "Library of National, State, and Individual Records," and received from him the following reply:

"NEW YORK, December 22, 1891.

"STEPHEN S. WISE, Esq.

"MY DEAR SIR: Referring to the article in THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW on 'Jews in the Union Army,' to which you call my attention, I would say that I consider it both absurd and unjust, as I have in mind the names of many Jewish officers who served in the late war with distinction and repeatedly received 'honorable mention' for bravery in the discharge of duty. To be more particular, I find by the most cursory reference to the 'Townsend Library of National, State, and Individual Records,' the following names of those who have done credit to their country and their race: General F. Knefler, General Blumenberg, Major Alfred Mordecai, Lieutenant-Colonel Neuman, David Ezekiel, Elias Leon, David M. Cohen, Edward D. Taussig, Captain Michaelis, J. S. Emanuel, Henry B. Nunes, Henry B. Nunes, Jr., J. R. Nunes, Emanuel Phillips, Jonas Barnett, Capt. J. P. Levy, Albert A. Michaelson, Levi M. Harby, Mark E. Cohen, Israel Moses, Isaac Moses, Mordecai Myers, and Colonel Asch. These instances recorded, and a host of gallant soldiers and sailors of Jewish extraction who have shed lustre on their race, will suffice to awaken a higher regard for their talents in a field hitherto unexplored. You are at liberty to examine my work at any time, and thus further substantiate my statements and demonstrate the injurious character of those in the article referred to. Very truly yours,

"THOMAS S. TOWNSEND."

Availing myself of this kind invitation, I found, upon reference to Mr. Townsend's work, the names of a large number of Jewish soldiers recorded in the "Roll of Honor" for specially distinguished and meritorious services; among whom are Lehman Israels, Sergeant Jacobson, Captain Asche, Samuel Benjamin, Colonel Hayman, Jacob Fry, Joseph S. Abraham, Nathan S. Benjamin, Isaac H. Dann, and Charles Abrams.

Simon Wolf, of Washington, D. C., without any attempt at elaboration, collates the names of eighty officers (some holding the high rank of general), the majority of whom distinguished themselves by the most reckless daring and zeal. Mr. Wolf states, and I am prepared to justify his claim, that the proportion of those of the Jewish religion who fought in the army is as large as that of any other faith.

Considering that the number of Jews could not have been greater than 140,000, and that at least 6,000 fought in the Union army alone, the percentage is truly striking.

I will concede that Generals Lyons and Rosecrans were not Jews. This admission on my part is important, for it constitutes the only point in which I subscribe to the truth of Mr. Rogers's statements. Unworthy of notice is his insinuation that wherever the Jews stood "shoulder to shoulder" with their fellow-citizens they were "promptly ordered out for speculating in cotton, and conveying information to the Confederates." Notwithstanding the fact that a number of soldiers were charged with the

offence of "speculating in cotton" and that not a few Christians met with punishment, he deems the Jews alone, of all people, entitled to blame. It is no secret that General Grant repeatedly declared that his famous order No. 11, expelling the Jews from Paducah, Kentucky, was the result of carelessness; had he thoroughly investigated affairs before sending out this order, his action would have been different, and he never ceased to regret that he issued it. It was promptly revoked, and *The Times* of January 18, 1863, says: "Its immediate and peremptory abrogation saved the government from a blot and redeemed us from disgrace." Will it surprise Mr. Rogers to learn that a resolution censuring General Grant for his order expelling the Jews was the subject of much debate in the Senate, and that the fear that General Grant's influence with his soldiers might thereby be lessened saved him from the humiliation of censure?

The issuing of General Sherman's order, similar to that of Grant, was confessedly prompted by a misunderstanding of the true status of affairs. Readily believing all that was told him, he issued the order, but its injustice he conceded, and he endeavored to make reparation by confessing that he was mistaken and deceived.

While Mr. Rogers deserves to feel mortified and humiliated, I cannot allow my interest in the subject to interfere with the lesson I hope he will derive from my exposure of his weak, silly, and contemptible statements, which he seems prompted to make with a view to casting odium upon my race; and I hope I have taught him not to make rash statements that he cannot substantiate. In conclusion, I think I have succeeded in disabusing the mind of the reader of any injurious impression that may have been created by the statement of the author of the article to which I reply.

STEPHEN S. WISE.

RAILROAD CONSOLIDATION.

IT DOES not require any argument to demonstrate that consolidation, up to a certain point, in all business transactions, must be advantageous to the interests directly involved. Whether such consolidation will result in advantages to other interests, or to the general public, will depend largely upon circumstances. That large transactions, large purchases, the percentage of decrease in cost, not only in the original purchases, but in freight, insurances, and every other item which goes to make up the increase in the capital involved, and the resultant dividends, possess great advantages over smaller transactions, goes without saying. This is a matter of every-day demonstration. It goes to show that where great interests are consolidated in the hands of one man, with power to control them with the will of an autocrat, the object of those interests will be better attained than when those powers are distributed amongst half a dozen different persons. These latter are apt to become, on the slightest clashing of interests, such a "balky team" in commercial matters as General Grant once alluded to in military affairs. No reasonable man will attempt to deny that one railroad corporation operating a single road between Albany and Buffalo has immense advantages, and can transport passengers and freight better, more promptly, and more cheaply between those two points than half a dozen different companies could. But, in the absence of competition, does it follow that it will do it?

When the first Pacific railroad was in course of construction, and